

## Resolution of comments on redlined text

- 1 - Tribal consumption tables should be **added** (added or retained?).
- 2 - "Potential Future" was added to all table titles; **tables need to be revised**.
- 3 - "Potential Future" added to the titles of the figures. Figures need to be revised.
- 4 - Revision is acceptable to LWG
- 5 - EPA Direction added to Section 1.2 – **LWG did not provide in other areas**.
- 6 - Revision is acceptable to LWG
- 7 - The text is correct unless the LWG did not actually use RSLs as screening levels for the selection of drinking water COPCs.
- 8 - "Potential Future" was added to all descriptions of drinking water scenario.
- 9 - I am so done with the discussion of Sean's paper.
- 10 – The discussion re water temp and dry suits appropriately applies to commercial divers. Not clear why LWG thinks otherwise.
- 11 – Same as #10.
- 12 – The scenario will be described as "Recreational and Subsistence Fishers" regardless of the outcome the CTE-RME discussions.
- 13 – "Potential Future."
- 14 – Added discussion of Portland's future plans to not use the LWR as a drinking water source.
- 15 – There will be very little discussion of the "context" of the exposure scenarios.
- 16 – Text now refers only to "fishers."
- 17 – Same as 16.
- 18 – Potential future use of LWR as a drinking water source.
- 19 – Future again.
- 20 – Revision acceptable to LWG.
- 21 – The dermal equations have been corrected.
- 22 – The text regarding the 1990 Census data showing an average work year of 225 days is fine as is.
- 23 – Changed title to Recreational and Subsistence Fishers.
- 24 – "Primary contributors to risk estimates" crap.

25 – The text was moved to the next paragraph as requested, but may be moot after RME discussions.

26 – Same as 25.

27 – Discussion of crayfish consumption at 3.3 g/day added.

28 – Not sure what to do, don't think we agreed to only present chemical specific risk/hazards greater than a certain value.

29 – Added "natural quality."

30 – Text revised generally as requested.

31 – I am not adding a parenthetical organic and inorganic, it's already sufficiently explanatory.

32 – Revision is acceptable to LWG.

33 – "Potential Future."

34 – Refers back to submittal on Chemicals potentially posing unacceptable risk and primary contributors to risk. See my email from Friday.

35 – PDBEs are now a separate bullet.